arXiv:1108.3875v1 [math.GT] 19 Aug 2011

FINITE GROUP ACTIONS AND G-MONOPOLE CLASSES ON SMOOTH 4-MANIFOLDS

CHANYOUNG SUNG

Abstract. On a smooth closed oriented 4-manifold M with a smooth action by a compact Lie group G, we define a G-monopole class as an element of $H^2(M;\mathbb{Z})$ which is the first Chern class of a G-equivariant Spin^c structure which has a solution of the Seiberg-Witten equations for any G-invariant Riemannian metric on M.

We find $\mathbb{Z}_k$-monopole classes on some $\mathbb{Z}_k$-manifolds such as the connected sum of k copies of a 4-manifold with nontrivial mod 2 Seiberg-Witten invariant or Bauer-Furuta invariant, where the $\mathbb{Z}_k$-action is a cyclic permutation of k summands.

As an application, we produce infinitely many exotic non-free actions of $\mathbb{Z}_k \oplus H$ on some connected sums of finite number of $S^2 \times S^2$, $\mathbb{C}P_2$, $\overline{\mathbb{C}P}_2$, and $K3$ surfaces, where $k \geq 2$, and H is any finite group acting freely on S^3.

1. Introduction

Let M be a smooth closed oriented manifold of dimension 3 or 4. A second cohomology class of M is called a *monopole class* if it arises as the first Chern class of a Spin^c structure for which the Seiberg-Witten equations admit a solution for every choice of a Riemannian metric. Clearly a basic class, i.e. the first Chern class of a Spin^c structure with nonzero Seiberg-Witten invariant is a monopole class. However, the ordinary Seiberg-Witten invariant which is gotten by the intersection theory on the Seiberg-Witten moduli space is trivial in many important cases, for example connected sums of 4-manifolds with $b_2^+ > 0$.

Bauer and Furuta [4, 5] made a breakthrough in detecting a monopole class on certain connected sums of 4-manifolds. Their new brilliant idea is to generalize the Pontryagin-Thom construction to a proper map between infinite-dimensional spaces, which is the sum of a linear Fredholm map and

---

Date: August 22, 2011.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 57R57, 57R55, 57R50, 57M60.

Key words and phrases. Seiberg-Witten equations, monopole class, group action.

This work was supported by the National Research Foundation of Korea(NRF) grant funded by the Korea government(MEST). (No. 2011-0002791, 2011-0001565).

a compact map, and take some sort of a stably-framed bordism class of the Seiberg-Witten moduli space as an invariant. However its applications are still limited in that this new invariant which is expressed as a stable cohomotopy class is difficult to compute, and we are seeking after further refined invariants of the Seiberg-Witten moduli space.

In the meantime, sometimes we need a solution of the Seiberg-Witten equations for a specific metric rather than any Riemannian metric. The case we have in mind is the one when a manifold M and its Spin^c structure $\mathfrak{s}$ admit a smooth action by a finite group G and we are interested in finding a solution of the Seiberg-Witten equations for any G-invariant metric.

Thus for a G-invariant metric and perturbation, we consider the *G-monopole moduli space* $\mathfrak{X}$ consisting of G-invariant solutions modulo gauge equivalence. One can easily see that the ordinary moduli space $\mathfrak{M}$ is acted on by G, and $\mathfrak{X}$ turns out to be a subset of its G-fixed point set. The intersection theory on $\mathfrak{X}$ will give the *G-monopole invariant* $SW^G_{M,\mathfrak{s}}$ defined first by Y. Ruan [29], which is expected to be different from the ordinary Seiberg-Witten invariant $SW_{M,\mathfrak{s}}$.

In view of this, the following definition is relevant.

Definition 1. *Suppose that M admits a smooth action by a compact Lie group G preserving the orientation of M.*

A second cohomology class of M is called a G-monopole class *if it arises as the first Chern class of a G-equivariant Spin^c structure for which the Seiberg-Witten equations admit a G-invariant solution for every G-invariant Riemannian metric of M.*

When the G-monopole invariant is nonzero, its first Chern class has to be a G-monopole class. As another invariant for detecting a G-monopole class, one can also generalize the Bauer-Furuta invariant $BF_{M,\mathfrak{s}}$ in [4, 5] to the so-called *G-Bauer-Furuta invariant* $BF^G_{M,\mathfrak{s}}$, which is roughly the stable cohomotopy class of the monopole map between G-invariant subsets of the associated Hilbert bundles over $T^{b_1(M)^G}$ where $b_1(M)^G$ is the dimension of the space of G-invariant harmonic 1-forms on M. This should be distinguished from the G-equivariant Bauer-Furuta invariant in [35, 26], which is the stable G-homotopy class of the monopole map between the original Hilbert bundles over the Picard torus $T^{b_1(M)}$.

Using these invariants, we find G-monopole classes in some connected sums which have vanishing Seiberg-Witten invariant :

Theorem 1.1. *Let M and N be smooth closed oriented 4-manifolds satisfying $b_2^+(M) > 1$ and $b_2^+(N) = 0$, and $\bar{M}_k$ for any $k \geq 2$ be the connected sum $M\#\cdots\#M\#N$ where there are k summands of M.*

Suppose that N admits a smooth orientation-preserving $\mathbb{Z}_k$-action with at least one free orbit such that there exist a $\mathbb{Z}_k$-invariant Riemannian metric of positive scalar curvature and a $\mathbb{Z}_k$-equivariant Spin^c structure $\mathfrak{s}_N$ with $c_1^2(\mathfrak{s}_N) = -b_2(N)$.

Define a $\mathbb{Z}_k$-action on $\bar{M}_k$ induced from that of N and the cyclic permutation of the k summands of M glued along a free orbit in N, and let $\bar{\mathfrak{s}}$ be the Spin^c structure on $\bar{M}_k$ obtained by gluing $\mathfrak{s}_N$ and a Spin^c structure $\mathfrak{s}$ of M.

Then for any $\mathbb{Z}_k$-action on $\bar{\mathfrak{s}}$ covering the above $\mathbb{Z}_k$-action on $\bar{M}_k$, $SW^{\mathbb{Z}_k}_{\bar{M}_k,\bar{\mathfrak{s}}}$ mod 2 is nontrivial if $SW_{M,\mathfrak{s}}$ mod 2 is nontrivial, and also $BF^{\mathbb{Z}_k}_{\bar{M}_k,\bar{\mathfrak{s}}}$ is nontrivial, if $BF_{M,\mathfrak{s}}$ is nontrivial.

As an application of a G-monopole class to differential topology, we can detect exotic smooth group actions on some smooth 4-manifolds, by which we mean topologically equivalent but smoothly nonequivalent actions. We say that two smooth group actions G_1 and G_2 on a smooth manifold M is C^m-equivalent for $m = 0, 1, \cdots, \infty$, if there exists a C^m-homeomorphism $f : M \to M$ such that

$$G_1 = f \circ G_2 \circ f^{-1}.$$

Such exotic smooth actions of finite groups on smooth 4-manifolds have been found abundantly, for eg, [12, 6, 14, 2, 15, 38, 13]. But all of them are either free or cyclic actions.

In the final section, we use G-monopole invariant to find infinitely many non-free non-cyclic exotic group actions. For example, for any $k \geq 2$ and finite group H acting freely on S^3, there exist infinitely many exotic non-free actions of $\mathbb{Z}_k \oplus H$ on some connected sums of finite number of $S^2 \times S^2$, $\mathbb{C}P_2$, $\overline{\mathbb{C}P}_2$, and $K3$ surfaces.

The above theorem may be generalized to other types of N, and we leave a more complete study to a future project. Applications to Riemannian geometry such as G-invariant Einstein metrics and G-Yamabe invariant are rather straightforward from the curvature estimates, and will be dealt with in a forthcoming paper [34].

2. G-MONOPOLE INVARIANT

Let M be a smooth closed oriented 4-manifold. Suppose that a compact Lie group G acts on M smoothly preserving the orientation, and this action lifts to an action on a Spin^c structure $\mathfrak{s}$ of M. Once there is a lifting, any other lifting differs from it by an element of $Map(G \times M, S^1)$. We fix a lifting and put a G-invariant Riemannian metric g on M.

The corresponding spinor bundles $W_\pm$ are also G-equivariant, and we let $\Gamma(W_\pm)^G$ be the set of its G-invariant sections. When we put G as a superscript on a set, we always mean the subset consisting of its G-invariant elements. Thus $\mathcal{A}(W_+)^G$ is the space of G-invariant connections on $\det(W_+)$, which is identified as the space of G-invariant purely-imaginary valued 1-forms $\Gamma(\Lambda^1(M; i\mathbb{R}))^G$, and $\mathcal{G}^G = Map(M, S^1)^G$ is the set of G-invariant gauge transformations.

The perturbed Seiberg-Witten equations give a smooth map

$$H : \mathcal{A}(W_+)^G \times \Gamma(W_+)^G \times \Gamma(\Lambda^2_+(M; i\mathbb{R}))^G \to \Gamma(W_-)^G \times \Gamma(\Lambda^2_+(M; i\mathbb{R}))^G$$

defined by

$$H(A, \Phi, \varepsilon) = (D_A\Phi, F_A^+ - \Phi \otimes \Phi^* + \frac{|\Phi|^2}{2}\mathrm{Id} + \varepsilon),$$

where the domain and the range are endowed with L^2_{l+1} and L^2_l Sobolev norms for a positive integer l respectively, and D_A is a Spin^c Dirac operator. The G-monopole moduli space $\mathfrak{X}_\varepsilon$ for a perturbation ε is then defined as

$$\mathfrak{X}_\varepsilon := H_\varepsilon^{-1}(0)/\mathcal{G}^G$$

where H_ε denotes H restricted to $\mathcal{A}(W_+)^G \times \Gamma(W_+)^G \times \{\varepsilon\}$.

Lemma 2.1. *The quotient map*

$$p : \mathcal{A}(W_+)^G \times (\Gamma(W_+)^G - \{0\}) \to (\mathcal{A}(W_+)^G \times (\Gamma(W_+)^G - \{0\}))/\mathcal{G}$$

is bijective, and hence $\mathfrak{X}_\varepsilon$ is a subset of the ordinary Seiberg-Witten moduli space $\mathfrak{M}_\varepsilon$.

Proof. Obviously p is surjective, and to show that p is injective, suppose that (A_1, Φ_1) and (A_2, Φ_2) in $\mathcal{A}(W_+)^G \times (\Gamma(W_+)^G - \{0\})$ are equivalent under $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}$. Then

$$A_1 = A_2 - 2d\ln\gamma, \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi_1 = \gamma\Phi_2.$$

By the first equality, $d\ln\gamma$ is G-invariant.

Let S be the subset of M where γ is G-invariant. By the continuity of γ, S must be a closed subset. Since S contains a nonempty subset

$$\{x \in M | \Phi_1(x) \neq 0\},$$

S is nonempty. It suffices to show that S is open. Let $x_0 \in S$. Then we have that for any $g \in G$,

$$g^*\ln\gamma(x_0) = \ln\gamma(x_0), \quad \text{and} \quad g^*d\ln\gamma = d\ln\gamma,$$

which implies that $g^*\ln\gamma = \ln\gamma$ on an open neighborhood of x_0 on which $g^*\ln\gamma$ and $\ln\gamma$ are well-defined. By the compactness of G, there exists an open neighborhood of x_0 on which $g^*\ln\gamma$ is well-defined for all $g \in G$, and $\ln\gamma$ is G-invariant. This proves the openness of S. $\square$

The transversality is obtained by a generic G-invariant self-dual 2-form :

Lemma 2.2. *H is a submersion at each $(A,\Phi,\varepsilon)\in H^{-1}(0)$ for nonzero Φ.*

Proof. Obviously dH restricted to the last factor of the domain is onto the last factor of the range. Using the surjectivity in the ordinary setting, for any element $\psi\in\Gamma(W_-)^G$, there exists an element $(a,\varphi)\in\mathcal{A}(W_+)\times\Gamma(W_+)$ such that $dH(a,\varphi,0)=\psi$. The average

$$(\tilde{a},\tilde{\varphi})=\int_G h^*(a,\varphi)\ d\mu(h)$$

using a unit-volume G-invariant metric on G is an element of $\mathcal{A}(W_+)^G\times\Gamma(W_+)^G$. It follows from the smoothness of the G-action that every $h^*(a,\varphi)$ and hence $(\tilde{a},\tilde{\varphi})$ belong to the same Sobolev space as (a,φ) Moreover it still satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}dH(\tilde{a},\tilde{\varphi},0) &= \int_G dH(h^*(a,\varphi,0))\ d\mu(h)\\ &= \int_G h^*dH((a,\varphi,0))\ d\mu(h)\\ &= \int_G h^*\psi\ d\mu(h)\\ &= \psi,\end{aligned}$$

where we used the fact that dH is a G-equivariant differential operator. This completes the proof. ☐

We will assume that $b_2^+(M)^G$ which is the dimension of the space of G-invariant self-dual harmonic 2-forms of M is nonzero. Then $\mathfrak{X}_\varepsilon$ consists of irreducible solutions, and is a smooth manifold for generic ε by the Sard-Smale theorem. From now on, we will always assume that a generic ε is chosen so that $\mathfrak{X}_\varepsilon$ is smooth, and often omit the notation of ε, if no confusion arises.

Its dimension and orientation can be read from the G-equivariant elliptic complexes

$$d^+ + 2d^* : \Gamma(\Lambda^1)^G\to\Gamma(\Lambda^0\oplus\Lambda^2_+)^G$$

and

$$D_A:\Gamma(W_+)^G\to\Gamma(W_-)^G$$

using the index theory in the same way as the ordinary Seiberg-Witten moduli space.

Theorem 2.3. *When G is finite, $\mathfrak{X}_\varepsilon$ for any ε is compact.*

Proof. Following the proof of the ordinary Seiberg-Witten moduli space, we need the G-equivariant version of the gauge fixing lemma.

Lemma 2.4. *Let $\mathfrak{L}$ be a G-equivariant complex line bundle over M with a hermitian metric, and A_0 be a fixed G-invariant smooth unitary connection on it.*

Then for any $l \geq 0$ there are constants $K, C > 0$ depending on A_0 and l such that for any G-invariant L^2_l unitary connection A on $\mathfrak{L}$ there is a G-invariant L^2_{l+1} change of gauge σ so that $\sigma^*(A) = A_0 + \alpha$ where $\alpha \in L^2_l(T^*M \otimes i\mathbb{R})^G$ satisfies

$$d^*\alpha = 0, \quad \text{and} \quad ||\alpha||^2_{L^2_l} \leq C||F^+_A||^2_{L^2_{l-1}} + K.$$

Proof. We know that a gauge-fixing σ with the above estimate always exists, but we need to prove the existence of G-invariant σ. Write A as $A_0 + a$ where $a \in L^2_l(T^*M \otimes i\mathbb{R})^G$. Let $a = a^{harm} + df + d^*\beta$ be the Hodge decomposition. By the G-invariance of a, so are a^{harm}, df and $d^*\beta$. Applying the ordinary gauge fixing lemma to $A_0 + d^*\beta$, we have

$$||d^*\beta||^2_{L^2_l} \leq C'||F^+_{A_0+d^*\beta}||^2_{L^2_{l-1}} + K' = C'||F^+_A||^2_{L^2_{l-1}} + K'$$

for some constants $C', K' > 0$. Defining a G-invariant $i\mathbb{R}$-valued function $f_{av} = \frac{1}{|G|}\sum_{g\in G} g^*f$, we have

$$df = \frac{1}{|G|}\sum_{g\in G} g^*df = d(f_{av}) = -d\ln\exp(-f_{av}),$$

and hence df can be gauged away by a G-invariant gauge transformation $\exp(-f_{av})$. Write a^{harm} as $(n|G| + m)a^h$ for $m \in [0, |G|)$ and an integer $n \geq 0$, where $a^h \in H^1(M;\mathbb{Z})^G$ is not a positive multiple of another element of $H^1(M;\mathbb{Z})^G$. There exists $\sigma \in \mathcal{G}$ such that $a^h = -d\ln\sigma$. In general σ is not G-invariant, but

$$|G|a^h = \sum_{g\in G} g^*a^h = -d\ln\prod_{g\in G} g^*\sigma,$$

and hence $n|G|a^h$ can be gauged away by a G-invariant gauge transformation $\prod_{g\in G} g^*\sigma^n$. In summary, $A_0 + a$ is equivalent to $A_0 + ma^h + d^*\beta$ after a G-invariant gauge transformation, and

$$\begin{aligned}
||ma^h + d^*\beta||^2_{L^2_l} &\leq (||ma^h||_{L^2_l} + ||d^*\beta||_{L^2_l})^2 \\
&\leq |G|^2||a^h||^2_{L^2_l} + 2|G|||a^h||_{L^2_l}||d^*\beta||_{L^2_l} + ||d^*\beta||^2_{L^2_l} \\
&\leq 3|G|^2||a^h||^2_{L^2_l} + 3||d^*\beta||^2_{L^2_l} \\
&= K'' + 3C'||F^+_A||^2_{L^2_{l-1}} + 3K'
\end{aligned}$$

for a constant $K'' > 0$. This completes the proof. $\square$

Now the rest of the compactness proof proceeds in the same way as the ordinary case using the Weitzenböck formula and standard elliptic and Sobolev estimates. For details the readers are referred to [23]. $\square$

Remark If G is not finite, $\mathfrak{X}_\varepsilon$ may not be compact.

For example, consider $M = S^1 \times Y$ with the trivial Spin^c structure and its obvious S^1 action, where Y is a closed oriented 3-manifold. For any $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, $nd\theta$ where θ is the coordinate along S^1 is an S^1-invariant reducible solution. Although $nd\theta$ is gauge equivalent to 0, but never via an S^1-invariant gauge transformation which is an element of the pull-back of $C^\infty(Y, S^1)$. Therefore as $n \to \infty$, $nd\theta$ diverges modulo $\mathcal{G}^{S^1}$, which proves that $\mathfrak{X}_0$ is non-compact. $\square$

In the rest of this paper, we assume that G is finite. Then note that G induces smooth actions on

$$\mathcal{C} := \mathcal{A}(W_+) \times \Gamma(W_+),$$

$$\mathcal{B}^* = (\mathcal{A}(W_+) \times (\Gamma(W_+) - \{0\}))/\mathcal{G},$$

and also the Seiberg-Witten moduli space $\mathfrak{M}$ whenever it is smooth.

Since $\mathfrak{X}_\varepsilon$ is a subset of ε-perturbed moduli space $\mathfrak{M}_\varepsilon$, (actually a subset of the fixed locus $\mathfrak{M}_\varepsilon^G$ of a G-space $\mathfrak{M}_\varepsilon$), we can define the G-monopole invariant $SW^G_{M,\mathfrak{s}}$ by integrating the same cohomology classes as in the ordinary Seiberg-Witten invariant $SW_{M,\mathfrak{s}}$. Thus using the $\mathbb{Z}$-algebra isomorphism

$$\mu_{M,\mathfrak{s}} : \mathbb{Z}[H_0(M;\mathbb{Z})] \otimes \wedge^* H_1(M;\mathbb{Z})/\text{torsion} \xrightarrow{\sim} H^*(\mathcal{B}^*;\mathbb{Z}),$$

we define it as a function

$$SW^G_{M,\mathfrak{s}} : \mathbb{Z}[H_0(M;\mathbb{Z})] \otimes \wedge^* H_1(M;\mathbb{Z})/\text{torsion} \to \mathbb{Z}$$

$$c \mapsto \langle \mathfrak{X}, \mu_{M,\mathfrak{s}}(c) \rangle,$$

which is set to be 0 when the degree of $\mu(c)$ does not match $\dim \mathfrak{X}$. To be specific, for $c \in H_1(M, \mathbb{Z})$,

$$\mu_{M,\mathfrak{s}}(c) := Hol_c^*([d\theta])$$

where $[d\theta] \equiv 1 \in H^1(S^1, \mathbb{Z})$ and $Hol_c : \mathcal{B}^* \to S^1$ is given by the holonomy of each connection around c, and $\mu_{M,\mathfrak{s}}(U)$ for $U \equiv 1 \in H_0(M, \mathbb{Z})$ is given by the first Chern class of the S^1-bundle

$$\mathcal{B}^*_o = (\mathcal{A}(W_+) \times (\Gamma(W_+) - \{0\}))/\mathcal{G}_o$$

over $\mathcal{B}^*$ where $\mathcal{G}_o = \{g \in \mathcal{G} | g(o) = 1\}$ is the based gauge group for a fixed base point $o \in M$.

As in the ordinary case, $SW^G_{M,\mathfrak{s}}$ is independent of the choice of a G-invariant metric and a G-invariant perturbation ε, if $b_2^+(M)^G > 1$. When $b_2^+(M)^G = 1$, one should get an appropriate wall-crossing formula.

If no confusion arises, we will sometimes abuse notation to denote

$$SW^G_{M,\mathfrak{s}}(\underbrace{U\otimes\cdots\otimes U}_{[\frac{\dim \mathfrak{X}_{M,\mathfrak{s}}}{2}]})$$

just by $SW^G_{M,\mathfrak{s}}$. For an invariant as a G-manifold, we define the G-monopole polynomial of M as

$$SW^G_M := \sum_{\mathfrak{s}} SW^G_{M,\mathfrak{s}} PD(c_1(\mathfrak{s})) \in \mathbb{Z}[H_2(M;\mathbb{Z})^G],$$

where the summation is over the set of all G-equivariant Spin^c structures.

When $\mathfrak{M}$ happens to be smooth for a G-invariant perturbation, the induced G-action on it is a smooth action, and hence $\mathfrak{M}^G$ is a smooth submanifold. Moreover if the finite group action is free, then $\pi : M \to M/G$ is a covering, and $\mathfrak{s}$ is the pull-back of a Spin^c structure on M/G, which is determined up to the kernel of $\pi^* : H^2(M/G,\mathbb{Z}) \to H^2(M,\mathbb{Z})$, and all the irreducible solutions of the upstairs is precisely the pull-back of the corresponding irreducible solutions of the downstairs :

Theorem 2.5 ([30, 25])**.** *Let M and G be as above. Under the assumption that G is finite and the action is free, for a G-invariant metric and perturbation*

$$\mathfrak{X}_{M,\mathfrak{s}} = \mathfrak{M}_{M/G,\mathfrak{s}'} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mathfrak{M}^G_{M,\mathfrak{s}} \backsimeq \coprod_{c\in\ker\pi^*} \mathfrak{M}_{M/G,\mathfrak{s}'+c},$$

where the second one is a homeomorphism in general, and $\mathfrak{s}'$ is the Spin^c structure on M/G induced from $\mathfrak{s}$ and its G-action.

Finally we remark that the G-monopole invariant may change when a homotopically different lift of the G-action to the Spin^c structure is chosen. For more details, the readers are referred to [9, 27].

3. G-BAUER-FURUTA INVARIANT

For a more refined invariant to find a G-monopole class, one can also define G-Bauer-Furuta invariant in the same way as the ordinary Bauer-Furuta invariant.

Let $A_0 \in \mathcal{A}(W_+)^G$. Using the free action of the G-invariant based gauge group $\mathcal{G}^G_o$ on $(A_0 + i\ker d)^G \subset \mathcal{A}(W_+)^G$, one gets the quotient

$$(A_0 + i\ker d)^G/\mathcal{G}^G_o$$

which is diffeomorphic to $b_1(M)^G$-dimensional torus $T^{b_1(M)^G}$, and will be denoted by $Pic^G(M)$.[1]

For an integer $m \geq 4$, define infinite-dimensional Hilbert bundles $\mathcal{E}$ and $\mathcal{F}$ over $Pic^G(M)$ by

$$\mathcal{E} = ((A_0 + i \ker d)^G \times (L^2_{m+1}(W_+)^G \oplus L^2_{m+1}(\Lambda^1 M)^G \oplus H^0(M)^G))/\mathcal{G}_o^G$$

and

$$\mathcal{F} = ((A_0+i \ker d)^G \times (L^2_m(W_-)^G \oplus L^2_m(\Lambda^2_+ M)^G \oplus L^2_m(\Lambda^0 M)^G \oplus H^1(M)^G))/\mathcal{G}_o^G$$

where all the forms are purely-imaginary-valued, and $\mathcal{G}_o^G$ acts only on the connection part and the spinor parts.

The G-monopole map $\tilde{H} : \mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{F}$ is an S^1-equivariant continuous fiber-preserving map defined as

$$[A, \Phi, a, f] \mapsto [A, D_{A+a}\Phi, F^+_{A+a} - \Phi \otimes \Phi^* + \frac{|\Phi|^2}{2}\mathrm{Id}, d^*a + f, a^{harm}],$$

which is fiberwisely the sum of a linear Fredholm map and a nonlinear compact map. Note that

$$\tilde{H}^{-1}(\text{zero section})/S^1$$

is exactly the G-monopole moduli space. The important property that the inverse image of any bounded set in $\mathcal{F}$ is bounded follows directly from the corresponding boundedness property of the ordinary monopole map.

Our G-Bauer-Furuta invariant is then defined as the homotopy class of this G-monopole map in the set of the S^1-equivariant continuous fiber-preserving maps which differ from the G-monopole map by the fiberwise compact perturbations and have bounded inverse image for any bounded set in $\mathcal{F}$.

To express the G-monopole map as an S^1-equivariant stable cohomotopy class, we take an S^1-equivariant trivialization $\mathcal{F} \simeq Pic^G(M) \times \mathcal{U}$ with the projection map $\varpi : \mathcal{F} \to \mathcal{U}$, and take finite-dimensional approximations of

$$\varpi \circ \tilde{H} : \mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{U}.$$

Define an S^1-equivariant stable cohomotopy group

$$\pi^0_{S^1,\mathcal{U}}(Pic^G(M); \ker(D)^G \ominus \mathrm{coker}(D)^G \ominus \underline{H^2_+(M)^G})$$

as

$$\mathrm{colim}_U [S^U \wedge T(\ker(D)^G), S^U \wedge S^{\varpi(\mathrm{coker}(D)^G) \oplus H^2_+(M)^G} \wedge S^0]^{S^1},$$

---

[1] Here we are using the assumption that G is finite to show that the rank of the sublattice of $H^1(M;\mathbb{Z})^G$, which is generated by $\mathcal{G}_o^G$ is $b_1(M)^G$. For $\alpha \in H^1(M;\mathbb{Z})^G$, let $\alpha = d \ln g$ for $g \in \mathcal{G}_o^G$. Then

$$|G|\alpha = \sum_{h \in G} h^* d \ln g = d \ln \prod_{h \in G} h^* g.$$

where U runs all finite dimensional real vector subspaces of $\mathcal{U}$ transversal to $\varpi(\mathrm{coker}(D)^G) \oplus H^2_+(M)^G$. Here $T(E) \wedge S^W$ denotes the smash product of the Thom space of a vector bundle E and the one-point compactification of a vector space W, and

$$\ker(D)^G \ominus \mathrm{coker}(D)^G \ominus \underline{H^2_+(M)^G} \in K^0(Pic^G(M))$$

is the difference of the virtual index bundle of the Spin^c Dirac operator $D_A : L^2_{m+1}(W_+)^G \to L^2_m(W_-)^G$ and the trivial bundle of rank $b_2^+(M)^G$.

Then our G-monopole map gives an element $BF^G_{M,\mathfrak{s}}$ in the above stable cohomotopy group, which we call the G-Bauer-Furuta invariant of $(M, \mathfrak{s})$. Most importantly

Theorem 3.1. *If $BF^G_{M,\mathfrak{s}}$ is nontrivial, then $c_1(\mathfrak{s})$ is a G-monopole class.*

Proof. The method is the same as the ordinary Bauer-Furuta invariant $BF_{M,\mathfrak{s}}$. For a proof, see [20]. ☐

4. Connected sums and $\mathbb{Z}_k$-monopole invariant

For $(\bar{M}_k, \bar{\mathfrak{s}})$ described in theorem 1.1, there is at least one obvious $\mathbb{Z}_k$-action on $\bar{\mathfrak{s}}$ coming from a $\mathbb{Z}_k$-action on $\mathfrak{s}_N$ and $\mathbb{Z}_k$-equivariant gluing of k-copies of $\mathfrak{s}$. We will call such an action "canonical" and denote its generator by τ. Any other lifting of the $\mathbb{Z}_k$-action on $\bar{M}_k$ is given by a group generated by $\mathfrak{g} \circ \tau$ where $\mathfrak{g}$ is a gauge transformation of $\bar{\mathfrak{s}}$, i.e. the multiplication by a smooth S^1-valued function on $\bar{M}_k$.

In general, there are homotopically inequivalent liftings of the $\mathbb{Z}_k$-action on $\bar{M}_k$, but we have

Lemma 4.1. *Any lifted action on $\bar{\mathfrak{s}}$ can be homotoped to another lifting which is equal to a canonical lifting on the cylindrical gluing regions.*

Proof. Let σ be a generator of a $\mathbb{Z}_k$ action on $\bar{\mathfrak{s}}$ covering the $\mathbb{Z}_k$-action on $\bar{M}_k$. For the trivialization of the Spin^c structure on the k cylindrical regions $\cup_{j=1}^k U_j$ where each U_j is diffeomorphic to $S^3 \times [0,1]$ such that the generator τ of a canonical action acts as the multiplication by 1 there,

$$\sigma|_{U_j} : \bar{\mathfrak{s}}|_{U_j} \to \bar{\mathfrak{s}}|_{U_{j+1}}$$

covering the identity map from U_j to U_{j+1} is given by the multiplication by

$$e^{i\sigma_j} \in C^\infty(S^3 \times [0,1], S^1).$$

Since $\sigma^k = Id$,

$$\sum_{j=1}^k \sigma_j \equiv 0 \mod 2\pi.$$

By the fact that $H^1(S^3 \times [0,1]; \mathbb{Z}) = 0$, any two gauge transformations on $S^3 \times [0,1]$ can be homotoped to each other, and hence one can easily see that there exists a smooth relative homotopy

$$H_j(x,t) : (S^3 \times [0,1]) \times [0,1] \to S^1$$

such that

$$\begin{gathered} H_j(\cdot, 0) = e^{i\sigma_j(\cdot)}, \\ H_j(x, \cdot) = e^{i\sigma_j(x)} \text{ for all } x \in S^3 \times \{0,1\}, \\ H_j(\cdot, 1)|_{S^3 \times [\frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3}] \times \{1\}} = 1. \end{gathered}$$

But $\prod_{j=1}^k H_j$ may not be 1 to fail to form a group $\mathbb{Z}_k$. To remedy this, modify H_k by

$$\tilde{H}_k := H_k \cdot \overline{\prod_{j=1}^k H_j}$$

which is also a smooth relative homotopy satisfying the above three properties and produces

$$(\prod_{j=1}^{k-1} H_j)\tilde{H}_k = 1.$$

Therefore we have obtained a homotopy of the initial action to the action which is trivial on each $S^3 \times [\frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3}]$, while keeping equal to the initial action outside $\cup_{j=1}^k U_j$. □

By our assumption of $b_2^+(\bar{M}_k)^{\mathbb{Z}_k} = b_2^+(M) > 1$, this homotopy of the action does not change the $\mathbb{Z}_k$-monopole invariant and also obviously the G-Bauer-Furuta invariant. From now on we always assume that the $\mathbb{Z}_k$-action on $\bar{\mathfrak{s}}$ is equal to a canonical action on the cylindrical gluing regions, and take a trivialization of the Spin^c structure of k cylindrical gluing regions so that a canonical action acts as the multiplication by 1.

Theorem 4.2. *Let $(\bar{M}_k, \bar{\mathfrak{s}})$ be as in theorem 1.1 and $d \geq 0$ be an integer.*

If $H_1(N;\mathbb{R})^{\mathbb{Z}_k} = 0$, then for a which is either 1 or $a_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge a_j$

$$SW^{\mathbb{Z}_k}_{\bar{M}_k, \bar{\mathfrak{s}}}(U^d a) \equiv SW_{M,\mathfrak{s}}(U^d a) \quad mod\ 2,$$

where U denotes the positive generator of the zeroth homology of $\bar{M}_k$ or M, and each $a_i \in H_1(M;\mathbb{Z})/torsion$ also denotes any of k corresponding elements in $H_1(M_k;\mathbb{Z})$ by abuse of notation.

If $H_1(N;\mathbb{R})^{\mathbb{Z}_k} \neq 0$, then

$$SW^{\mathbb{Z}_k}_{\bar{M}_k, \bar{\mathfrak{s}}}(U^d a \wedge b_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge b_\nu) \equiv SW_{M,\mathfrak{s}}(U^d a) \quad mod\ 2,$$

where $\{b_1, \cdots, b_\nu\} \subset H_1(\bar{M}_k;\mathbb{Z})$ gives a basis of $H_1(N;\mathbb{R})^{\mathbb{Z}_k}$.

Proof. First we consider the case when the action on N is not free.

We take a $\mathbb{Z}_k$-invariant metric of positive scalar curvature on N. In order to do the connected sum with k copies of M, we perform a Gromov-Lawson type surgery [18, 32] around each point of a free orbit of $\mathbb{Z}_k$ keeping the positivity of scalar curvature to get a Riemannian manifold $\hat{N}$ with cylindrical ends with each end isometric to a Riemannian product of a round S^3 and $\mathbb{R}$. We suppose that this is done in a symmetric way so that the $\mathbb{Z}_k$-action on $\hat{N}$ is isometric.

On M part, we put any metric and perform a Gromov-Lawson surgery with the same cylindrical end as above. Let's denote this by $\hat{M}$. Now chop the cylinders at sufficiently large length and then glue $\hat{N}$ and k-copies of $\hat{M}$ along the boundary to get a desired $\mathbb{Z}_k$-invariant metric g_k on $\bar{M}_k$. Sometimes we abuse the notation $\bar{M}_k$ to mean $(\bar{M}_k, g_k)$.

Let's find out the ordinary moduli space $\mathfrak{M}_{\bar{M}_k}$ of $(\bar{M}_k, \bar{\mathfrak{s}})$. Let $\mathfrak{M}_{\hat{M}}$ and $\mathfrak{M}_{\hat{N}}$ be the moduli spaces of finite-energy solutions of $(\hat{M}, \mathfrak{s})$ and $(\hat{N}, \mathfrak{s}_N)$ respectively.

By the gluing theory[2] of the moduli space, which is now a standard method in gauge theory, $\mathfrak{M}_{\hat{M}}$ is diffeomorphic to $\mathfrak{M}_M$. In $\mathfrak{M}_{\hat{M}}$, we use a compact-supported self-dual 2-form for a generic perturbation.

Since $\hat{N}$ has a metric of positive scalar curvature and the property that $b_2^+(\hat{N}) = 0$ and $c_1^2(\mathfrak{s}_{\hat{N}}) = -b_2(\hat{N})$, $\hat{N}$ also has no gluing obstruction even without perturbation so that

$$\mathfrak{M}_N = \mathfrak{M}_{\hat{N}} = \mathfrak{M}_{\hat{N}}^{red} \simeq T^{b_1(N)},$$

which can be identified with the set of L^2-harmonic 1-forms on $\hat{N}$ modulo gauge, i.e.

$$H^1_{cpt}(\hat{N}, \mathbb{R})/H^1_{cpt}(\hat{N}, \mathbb{Z}).$$

(Here by T^0 we mean a point, and $\mathfrak{M}^{red} \subset \mathfrak{M}$ denotes the moduli space of reducible solutions.)

As is well-known, approximate solutions on $\bar{M}_k$ are obtained by chopping-off solutions on each $\hat{M}$ and $\hat{N}$ at a large cylindrical length and then grafting them to $\bar{M}_k$ using a $\mathbb{Z}_k$-invariant partition of unity. This gluing process commutes with gauge transformations which are constant on gluing regions. But one can take local slices so that their transition functions are gauge transformations which are constant on gluing regions. Thus we have a well-defined gluing of moduli spaces to get a so-called approximate moduli space

---

[2] For more details, one may consult [28, 31, 37, 33, 21].

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\mathfrak{M}}_{\bar{M}_k} &= ((\underbrace{\mathfrak{M}^o_{\hat{M}}\times\cdots\times\mathfrak{M}^o_{\hat{M}}}_{k})/S^1)\times\mathfrak{M}_{\hat{N}}\\ &= ((\underbrace{\mathfrak{M}_{\hat{M}}\times\cdots\times\mathfrak{M}_{\hat{M}}}_{k})\tilde{\times}T^{k-1})\times T^{b_1(N)},\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathfrak{M}^o_{\hat{M}}$ is the based moduli space fibering over $\mathfrak{M}_{\hat{M}}$ with fiber $\mathcal{G}_o/\mathcal{G} = S^1$, and $\tilde{\times}$ means a T^{k-1}-bundle over $\underbrace{\mathfrak{M}_{\hat{M}}\times\cdots\times\mathfrak{M}_{\hat{M}}}_{k}$.

There is a diffeomorphism

$$\Upsilon : \tilde{\mathfrak{M}}_{\bar{M}_k} \to \mathfrak{M}_{\bar{M}_k}$$

given by a very small isotopy in $\mathfrak{B}^*$, once we choose a normal bundle of $\tilde{\mathfrak{M}}_{\bar{M}_k}$ in $\mathfrak{B}^*$. They get close exponentially as the length of the cylinders in $\bar{M}_k$ increases.

An important fact for us is that the same k copies of a compactly supported self-dual 2-form can be used for the perturbation on M parts, while no perturbation is put on the N part. Along with the $\mathbb{Z}_k$-invariance of the Riemannian metric g_k, the perturbed Seiberg-Witten equations for $(\bar{M}_k, g_k)$ are $\mathbb{Z}_k$-equivariant so that the induced smooth $\mathbb{Z}_k$-action on $\mathcal{B}^*$ maps $\mathfrak{M}_{\bar{M}_k}$ to itself.

Let's describe elements of $\tilde{\mathfrak{M}}_{\bar{M}_k}$ for $(\bar{M}_k, g_k)$. Let $[\xi] \in \mathfrak{M}_{\hat{M}}$, where $[\ \ ]$ denotes a gauge equivalence class from now on. Let $\tilde{\xi}$ be an approximate solution of ξ cut-off at large cylindrical length, and $\tilde{\xi}(\theta)$ be its gauge-transform under the gauge transformation by $e^{i\theta} \in C^\infty(\hat{M}, S^1)$. (From now on, the tilde $\tilde{}$ of a solution will mean its cut-off.) Any element in $\tilde{\mathfrak{M}}_{\bar{M}_k}$ can be written as an ordered $(k+1)$-tuple

$$[(\tilde{\xi}_1(\theta_1), \cdots, \tilde{\xi}_k(\theta_k), \tilde{\eta})]$$

for each $[\xi_i] \in \mathfrak{M}_{\hat{M}}$ and constants θ_i's, where the i-th term for $i = 1, \cdots, k$ represents the approximate solution grafted[3] on the i-th M summand, and the last term is a chop-off of $\eta \in \mathfrak{M}^{red}_{\hat{N}}$. We still have to mod out these

---

[3] Here, grafting over each M part is done via the identification of the Spin^c structure of each M part using a canonical action. Thus a canonical action τ on it is given by the permutation of approximate solutions on M parts, i.e.

$$\tau^*(\tilde{\xi}_1(\theta_1), \cdots, \tilde{\xi}_k(\theta_k), \tilde{\eta}) = (\tilde{\xi}_k(\theta_k), \tilde{\xi}_1(\theta_1), \cdots, \tilde{\xi}_{k-1}(\theta_{k-1}), \tau^*\tilde{\eta}).$$

$(k+1)$-tuples by S^1, and hence there is a bijective correspondence

$$\begin{array}{c}\tilde{\mathfrak{M}}_{\bar{M}_k} \\ \wr\| \\ \{[(\tilde{\xi_1}(\theta_1),\cdots,\tilde{\xi}_{k-1}(\theta_{k-1}),\tilde{\xi_k}(0),\tilde{\eta})]\mid[\eta]\in\mathfrak{M}_{\hat{N}},[\xi_i]\in\mathfrak{M}_{\hat{M}},\theta_i\in[0,2\pi)\ \forall i\},\end{array}\tag{4.1}$$

when the cut-off is done at sufficiently large cylindrical length.

In taking cut-offs of solutions on $\hat{N}$, we will use special a slice, i.e. a gauge representative of $\mathfrak{M}_{\hat{N}}=T^{b_1(N)}$. Fix a $\mathbb{Z}_k$-invariant connection η_0 such that $[\eta_0]\in\mathfrak{M}_{\hat{N}}$, which exists by taking the $\mathbb{Z}_k$-average of any reducible solution, and take compact-supported closed 1-forms $\beta_1,\cdots,\beta_{b_1(N)}$ which compose a basis of $H^1_{cpt}(\hat{N};\mathbb{Z})$ and are zero on the cylindrical gluing regions. Any element $[\eta]\in\mathfrak{M}_{\hat{N}}$ can be expressed as

$$\eta=\eta_0+\sum_i c_i\beta_i$$

for $c_i\in\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$, and the gauge equivalence class of its cut-off

$$\tilde{\eta}=\rho\eta=\rho\eta_0+\sum_i c_i\beta_i$$

for a ($\mathbb{Z}_k$-invariant) cut-off function ρ is well-defined independently of the mod $\mathbb{Z}$ ambiguity of each c_i.

We let σ be a generator of the $\mathbb{Z}_k$-action. By lemma 4.1, σ is equal to 1 on the cylindrical gluing regions, and hence σ can be obviously extended to an action on the Spin^c structure of $\hat{N}\cup\amalg_{i=1}^k\hat{M}$ and also its moduli space of finite-energy monopoles. By the $\mathbb{Z}_k$-invariance of ρ

$$\sigma^*\tilde{\eta}=\sigma^*(\rho\eta)=\rho\sigma^*\eta=\widetilde{\sigma^*\eta},$$

and thus

$$\sigma^*(\tilde{\xi_1}(\theta_1),\cdots,\tilde{\xi_k}(0),\tilde{\eta}) \;=\; (\tilde{\xi_k}(\sigma_k),\tilde{\xi_1}(\theta_1+\sigma_1),\cdots,\tilde{\xi}_{k-1}(\theta_{k-1}+\sigma_{k-1}),\widetilde{\sigma^*\eta}),\tag{4.2}$$

where all $e^{i\sigma_i}\in C^\infty(\hat{M},S^1)$ are equal to 1 on the cylindrical gluing regions and satisfy

$$\sum_{i=1}^k\sigma_i\equiv 0 \mod 2\pi.$$

Lemma 4.3. *The $\mathbb{Z}_k$-action on $\mathcal{B}^*$ maps $\tilde{\mathfrak{M}}_{\bar{M}_k}$ to itself.*

Proof. Since $\sigma^*\beta_i$ also gives an element of $H^1_{cpt}(\hat{N};\mathbb{Z})$, let's let $\sigma^*\beta_i$ be cohomologous to $\sum_j d_{ij}\beta_j$ for each i. Thus

$$\widetilde{\sigma^*\eta} = \rho\sigma^*(\eta_0 + \sum_i c_i\beta_i) = \rho\eta_0 + \sum_i c_i\sigma^*\beta_i$$

is gauge-equivalent to

$$\rho\eta_0 + \sum_{i,j} c_i d_{ij}\beta_j$$

which is the cut-off of $\eta_0 + \sum_{i,j} c_i d_{ij}\beta_j$. Also using the fact that all $e^{i\sigma_j}$ are also 1 on the cylindrical gluing regions so that they can be gauged away by a global gauge transformation on $\bar{M}_k$ without affecting $\widetilde{\sigma^*\eta}$, the RHS of (4.2) is gauge-equivalent to

$$(\tilde{\xi}_k(0), \tilde{\xi}_1(\theta_1), \cdots, \tilde{\xi}_{k-1}(\theta_{k-1}), \rho(\eta_0 + \sum_{i,j} c_i d_{ij}\beta_j))$$

which is an approximate solution. □

Moreover we may assume that Υ is $\mathbb{Z}_k$-equivariant by the following lemma.

Lemma 4.4. *Υ can be made $\mathbb{Z}_k$-equivariant, and the smooth submanifold $\mathfrak{M}^{\mathbb{Z}_k}_{\bar{M}_k}$ pointwisely fixed under the action is isotopic to $\tilde{\mathfrak{M}}^{\mathbb{Z}_k}_{\bar{M}_k}$, the fixed point set in $\tilde{\mathfrak{M}}_{\bar{M}_k}$.*

Proof. To get a $\mathbb{Z}_k$-equivariant Υ which is determined by the choice of a smooth normal bundle of $\tilde{\mathfrak{M}}_{\bar{M}_k}$ in $\mathfrak{B}^*$, we only need to choose the normal bundle in a $\mathbb{Z}_k$-equivariant way. This can be achieved by taking the $\mathbb{Z}_k$-average of any smooth Riemannian metric defined in a small neighborhood of $\tilde{\mathfrak{M}}_{\bar{M}_k}$. The second statement is now obvious. □

As a preparation for finding $\mathbb{Z}_k$-fixed points of $\tilde{\mathfrak{M}}_{\bar{M}_k}$,

Lemma 4.5.

$$\mathfrak{M}^{\mathbb{Z}_k}_{\hat{N}} = \mathfrak{X}_{\hat{N}} \simeq T^\nu.$$

Proof. It's enough to show $\mathfrak{M}^{\mathbb{Z}_k}_{\hat{N}} \subset \mathfrak{X}_{\hat{N}}$. Suppose $[\eta] \in \mathfrak{M}^{\mathbb{Z}_k}_{\hat{N}}$, i.e. $[\sigma^*\eta] = [\eta]$. Then

$$\eta_{av} := \frac{1}{k}\sum_{i=1}^{k}(\sigma^i)^*\eta$$

satisfies that

$$[\eta_{av}] = [\eta], \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma^*\eta_{av} = \eta_{av}.$$

Since $(\sigma^i)^*\eta$ for all i is a reducible solution, so is their convex combination η_{av}. This completes the proof. □

Lemma 4.6. *The fixed point set* $\tilde{\mathfrak{M}}^{\mathbb{Z}_k}_{\bar{M}_k}$ *is diffeomorphic to* k *copies of*

$$\mathfrak{M}_M \times T^\nu$$

where T^0 *means a point.*

Proof. The condition for a fixed point is that

$$(\tilde{\xi}_k(0), \tilde{\xi}_1(\theta_1), \cdots, \tilde{\xi}_{k-1}(\theta_{k-1}), \widetilde{\sigma^*\eta}) \equiv (\tilde{\xi}_1(\theta_1), \cdots, \tilde{\xi}_k(0), \tilde{\eta})$$

modulo gauge transformations. By (4.1) this implies

$$[\xi_1] = [\xi_2] = \cdots = [\xi_k] \in \mathfrak{M}_{\hat{M}}, \text{ and } [\sigma^*\eta] = [\eta] \in \mathfrak{M}_{\hat{N}},$$

and

$$0 \equiv \theta_1 + \theta, \quad \theta_1 \equiv \theta_2 + \theta, \cdots, \theta_{k-1} \equiv 0 + \theta \mod 2\pi$$

for some constant $\theta \in [0, 2\pi)$. Summing up the above k equations gives

$$0 \equiv k\theta \mod 2\pi,$$

and hence

$$\theta = 0, \frac{2\pi}{k}, \cdots, \frac{2(k-1)\pi}{k},$$

which lead to the corresponding k solutions

$$[(\tilde{\xi}((k-1)\theta), \tilde{\xi}((k-2)\theta), \cdots, \tilde{\xi}(\theta), \tilde{\xi}(0), \tilde{\eta})] \tag{4.3}$$

for $\eta \in \mathfrak{X}_{\hat{N}}$, where we let $\xi_i = \xi$ for all i. Therefore $\tilde{\mathfrak{M}}^{\mathbb{Z}_k}_{\bar{M}_k}$ is diffeomorphic to k copies of $\mathfrak{M}_{\hat{M}} \times T^\nu$. □

Lemma 4.7. $\mathfrak{X}_{\bar{M}_k}$ *is diffeomorphic to* $\mathfrak{M}_M \times T^\nu$*.*

Proof. Let

$$\tilde{\Xi}_\theta = (\tilde{\xi}((k-1)\theta - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1}\sigma_i), \tilde{\xi}((k-2)\theta - \sum_{i=2}^{k-1}\sigma_i), \cdots, \tilde{\xi}(\theta - \sigma_{k-1}), \tilde{\xi}(0), \tilde{\eta})$$

for $\xi \in \mathfrak{M}_{\hat{M}}$ and $\eta \in \mathfrak{X}_{\hat{N}}$. Because all $e^{i\sigma_j}$ are also 1 on the cylindrical gluing regions, the gauge-equivalence class $[\tilde{\Xi}_\theta]$ is equal to the above (4.3), and moreover it has a nice property

$$\sigma^*\tilde{\Xi}_\theta = e^{i\theta} \cdot \tilde{\Xi}_\theta,$$

where $\cdot$ denotes the gauge action.

Recall that the canonical local slice at non-reducible (A, Φ) is given by

$$S_{(A,\Phi)} = \{(a, \varphi) \in \Gamma(\Lambda^1(\bar{M}_k; i\mathbb{R}) \oplus W_+) |\ 2d^*a - iIm(\varphi\overline{\Phi}) = 0\}.$$

Let $\Xi_\theta \in S_{\tilde{\Xi}_\theta}$ be the unique solution corresponding to $\tilde{\Xi}_\theta$ under Υ. Letting $\tilde{\Xi}_\theta = (A_\theta, \Phi_\theta)$,

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma^* S_{\tilde{\Xi}_\theta} &= \{(a,\varphi) \in \Gamma(\Lambda^1(\bar{M}_k; i\mathbb{R})) \oplus \Gamma(W_+) |\ 2d^*a - iIm(\varphi\overline{e^{i\theta}\Phi_\theta}) = 0\}\\ &= \{(a,\varphi) \in \Gamma(\Lambda^1(\bar{M}_k; i\mathbb{R})) \oplus \Gamma(W_+) |\ 2d^*a - iIm(e^{-i\theta}\varphi\overline{\Phi_\theta}) = 0\}\\ &= \{(a,e^{i\theta}\varphi) \in \Gamma(\Lambda^1(\bar{M}_k; i\mathbb{R})) \oplus \Gamma(W_+) |\ 2d^*a - iIm(\varphi\overline{\Phi_\theta}) = 0\}\\ &= e^{i\theta} \cdot S_{\tilde{\Xi}_\theta},\end{aligned}$$

where the first equality is due to the $\mathbb{Z}_k$-invariance of the metric g_k.

By the $\mathbb{Z}_k$-equivariance of Υ,

$$\begin{aligned}[][\sigma^*\Xi_\theta] &= \sigma^*[\Xi_\theta]\\ &= \sigma^*\Upsilon([\tilde{\Xi}_\theta])\\ &= \Upsilon(\sigma^*[\tilde{\Xi}_\theta])\\ &= \Upsilon([\sigma^*\tilde{\Xi}_\theta])\\ &= \Upsilon([e^{i\theta} \cdot \tilde{\Xi}_\theta])\\ &= [e^{i\theta} \cdot \Xi_\theta].\end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\sigma^*\Xi_\theta = e^{i\theta} \cdot \Xi_\theta, \tag{4.4}$$

because $\sigma^*\Xi_\theta$ and $e^{i\theta} \cdot \Xi_\theta$ are respectively the unique representatives of $\Upsilon([\sigma^*\tilde{\Xi}_\theta]) = \Upsilon([e^{i\theta} \cdot \tilde{\Xi}_\theta])$ in the slices $\sigma^* S_{\tilde{\Xi}_\theta}$ and $e^{i\theta} \cdot S_{\tilde{\Xi}_\theta}$ which are equal.

Thus $\sigma^*\Xi_0 = \Xi_0$ implies that $\mathfrak{X}_{\bar{M}_k}$ contains a copy of $\mathfrak{M}_M \times T^\nu$. The reason why that's all is the consequence of the following sublemma, completing the proof. □

Sublemma 4.8. *Let α be a solution of the Seiberg-Witten equations of $(\bar{M}_k, \bar{\mathfrak{s}})$ satisfying*

$$\sigma^*\alpha = e^{i\theta} \cdot \alpha$$

for $\theta = 0, \frac{2\pi}{k}, \cdots, \frac{2(k-1)\pi}{k}$. Then the subset of $\mathbb{Z}_k$-invariant elements in the gauge orbit $\mathcal{G} \cdot \alpha$ is

$$\mathcal{G}^{\mathbb{Z}_k} \cdot \alpha \quad \textit{if } \theta = 0,$$

and empty otherwise.

Proof. Let $g \in \mathcal{G}$. Suppose that $\sigma^*(g \cdot \alpha) = g \cdot \alpha$. Then combined with that

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma^*(g \cdot \alpha) &= \sigma^*(g) \cdot \sigma^*(\alpha)\\ &= \sigma^*(g) \cdot (e^{i\theta} \cdot \alpha)\\ &= (\sigma^*(g)e^{i\theta}) \cdot \alpha,\end{aligned}$$

it follows that

$$g \cdot \alpha = (\sigma^*(g)e^{i\theta}) \cdot \alpha,$$

which implies that

$$g = \sigma^*(g)e^{i\theta},$$

where we used the continuity of g and the fact that the spinor part of α is not identically zero on an open subset by the unique continuation property. Therefore

$$(\sigma^n)^*(g) = (\sigma^*)^n(g) = ge^{-in\theta} \tag{4.5}$$

for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Now if $\theta = 0$, (4.5) with $n = 1$ gives $g \in \mathcal{G}^{\mathbb{Z}_k}$ as expected. For other values of θ, choose a point $p \in \bar{M}_k$ with a nontrivial stabilizer group $\mathbb{Z}_l$ under the $\mathbb{Z}_k$-action.[4] Then evaluating (4.5) with $n = l$ at the point p gives

$$g = ge^{-il\theta}$$

which yields a desired contradiction. □

We claim that the μ cocycles on $\mathfrak{M}_M \times T^\nu$ and $\mathfrak{X}_{\bar{M}_k}$ coincide,[5] i.e.

$$\mu_{M,\mathfrak{s}}(a_i) = \mu_{\bar{M}_k,\bar{\mathfrak{s}}}(a_i), \quad \mu_{N,\mathfrak{s}_N}(b_i) = \mu_{\bar{M}_k,\bar{\mathfrak{s}}}(b_i), \quad \mu_{M,\mathfrak{s}}(U) = \mu_{\bar{M}_k,\bar{\mathfrak{s}}}(U)$$

for a_i and b_i as in the theorem statement, where the the equality means the identification under the above diffeomorphism. The first equality comes from that the holonomy maps Hol_{a_i} defined on $\mathfrak{M}_M$ and $\tilde{\mathfrak{M}}^{\mathbb{Z}_k}_{\bar{M}_k}$ are just the same, when the representative of a_i is chosen away from the gluing regions. Using the isotopy between $\mathfrak{M}^{\mathbb{Z}_k}_{\bar{M}_k}$ and $\tilde{\mathfrak{M}}^{\mathbb{Z}_k}_{\bar{M}_k}$, the induced maps $Hol^*_{a_i}$ to $H^1(\mathfrak{M}_M;\mathbb{Z})$ and $H^1(\mathfrak{M}^{\mathbb{Z}_k}_{\bar{M}_k};\mathbb{Z})$ are the same so that

$$\mu_{M,\mathfrak{s}}(a_i) = Hol^*_{a_i}([d\theta]) = \mu_{\bar{M}_k,\bar{\mathfrak{s}}}(a_i)$$

for each i. Likewise for the second equality. The third equality comes from that the S^1-fibrations on $\mathfrak{M}_M$ and $\tilde{\mathfrak{M}}^{\mathbb{Z}_k}_{\bar{M}_k}$ induced by the $\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{G}_o$ action are the same, while T^ν is fixed under $\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{G}_o$ action.

Finally we come to the evaluation of the Seiberg-Witten invariant on $\mathfrak{X}_{\bar{M}_k}$. If $\nu \neq 0$, then $\mu(b_1) \wedge \cdots \wedge \mu(b_\nu)$ is a generator of $H^\nu(T^\nu;\mathbb{Z})$, and hence it follows from the above identification of μ-cocycles that

$$SW^{\mathbb{Z}_k}_{\bar{M}_k,\bar{\mathfrak{s}}}(U^d b_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge b_\nu) \equiv SW_{M,\mathfrak{s}}(U^d) \mod 2,$$

and

$$SW^{\mathbb{Z}_k}_{\bar{M}_k,\bar{\mathfrak{s}}}(U^d a_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge a_j \wedge b_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge b_\nu) \equiv SW_{M,\mathfrak{s}}(U^d a_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge a_j) \mod 2.$$

---

[4] This is the only place we use the condition that the action on N is not free.

[5] In fact, this is also true for any other component of $\mathfrak{M}^{\mathbb{Z}_k}_{\bar{M}_k}$.

The case of $\nu = 0$ is just a special case. (If the diffeomorphism between $\mathfrak{X}_{\bar{M}_k}$ and $\mathfrak{M}_M \times T^\nu$ is orientation-preserving, then both invariants are exactly the same.)

If the action on N is free, then applying theorem 2.5 and the gluing theory, we have diffeomorphisms

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{X}_{\bar{M}_k,\bar{\mathfrak{s}}} &\simeq \mathfrak{M}_{M\#N/\mathbb{Z}_k,\mathfrak{s}\#\mathfrak{s}'_N} \\ &\simeq \mathfrak{M}_{M,\mathfrak{s}} \times \mathfrak{M}^{red}_{N/\mathbb{Z}_k,\mathfrak{s}'_N} \\ &\simeq \mathfrak{M}_{M,\mathfrak{s}} \times T^\nu, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathfrak{s}'_N$ is the Spin^c structure on $N/\mathbb{Z}_k$ induced from $\mathfrak{s}_N$ and its $\mathbb{Z}_k$ action induced from that of $\bar{\mathfrak{s}}$. The rest is the same as the non-free case. □

Remark We conjecture that the above diffeomorphism between $\mathfrak{X}_{\bar{M}_k}$ and $\mathfrak{M}_M \times T^\nu$ is orientation-preserving, when the homology orientations are appropriately chosen.

One may try to prove $\mathfrak{X}_{\bar{M}_k} \simeq \mathfrak{M}_M \times T^\nu$ by gluing G-monopole moduli spaces directly. But the above method of proof by gluing ordinary moduli spaces also shows that $\mathfrak{M}^{\mathbb{Z}_k}_{\bar{M}_k}$ is diffeomorphic to k copies of $\mathfrak{M}_M \times T^\nu$. □

Theorem 4.2 gives a proof of the statement in theorem 1.1 on the G-monopole invariant. The statement about the G-Bauer-Furuta invariant will be proved in the next section.

Finally we shall give some examples of $(N, \mathfrak{s}_N)$ in theorem 1.1.

Lemma 4.9. *On a smooth closed oriented 4-manifold N with $b_2^+(N) = 0$, any Spin^c structure $\mathfrak{s}$ satisfies*

$$c_1^2(\mathfrak{s}) \leq -b_2(N),$$

and the choice of a Spin^c structure $\mathfrak{s}_N$ satisfying $c_1^2(\mathfrak{s}_N) = -b_2(N)$ is always possible.

Proof. If $b_2(N) = 0$, it is obvious. The case of $b_2(N) > 0$ can be seen as follows. Using Donaldson's theorem [10, 11], we diagonalize the intersection form Q_N on $H^2(N;\mathbb{Z})$/torsion over $\mathbb{Z}$ with a basis $\{\alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_{b_2(N)}\}$ satisfying $Q_N(\alpha_i, \alpha_i) = -1$ for all i. Then for any Spin^c structure $\mathfrak{s}$, the rational part of $c_1(\mathfrak{s})$ should be of the form

$$\sum_{i=1}^{b_2(N)} a_i \alpha_i$$

where each $a_i \equiv 1 \bmod 2$, because

$$Q_N(c_1(\mathfrak{s}), \alpha) \equiv Q_N(\alpha, \alpha) \mod 2.$$

Consequently $|a_i| \geq 1$ for all i which means

$$c_1^2(\mathfrak{s}) = \sum_{i=1}^{b_2(N)} -a_i^2 \leq -b_2(N),$$

and we can get a Spin^c structure $\mathfrak{s}_N$ with

$$c_1(\mathfrak{s}_N) \equiv \sum_i \alpha_i \quad \text{modulo torsion}$$

by tensoring any $\mathfrak{s}$ with a line bundle L satisfying

$$2c_1(L) + c_1(\mathfrak{s}) \equiv \sum_i \alpha_i \quad \text{modulo torsion},$$

completing the proof. $\square$

Theorem 4.10. *Let X be one of*

$$S^4, \quad \overline{\mathbb{C}P}_2, \quad S^1 \times (L_1 \# \cdots \# L_n), \quad \textit{and} \quad \widehat{S^1 \times L}$$

where each L_i and L are quotients of S^3 by free actions of finite groups, and $\widehat{S^1 \times L}$ is the manifold obtained from the surgery on $S^1 \times L$ along an $S^1 \times \{pt\}$.

Then

$$X \ \# \ knZ$$

for any nonnegative integer n and any smooth closed oriented 4-manifold Z with $b_2^+(Z) = 0$ admitting a metric of positive scalar curvature satisfies the properties of N in theorem 1.1, where the Spin^c structure of $X \# knZ$ is given by gluing any Spin^c structure $\mathfrak{s}_X$ on X and any Spin^c structure $\mathfrak{s}_Z$ on Z satisfying $c_1^2(\mathfrak{s}_X) = -b_2(X)$ and $c_1^2(\mathfrak{s}_Z) = -b_2(Z)$ respectively.

Proof. First, we will define $\mathbb{Z}_k$ actions preserving a metric of positive scalar curvature. In fact, each X can be given such S^1 actions.

For $X = S^4$, one can take a $\mathbb{Z}_k$-action coming from any action of $S^1 \subset SO(5)$ preserving a round metric, and for $X = \overline{\mathbb{C}P}_2$, we have the following action

$$\lambda \cdot [z_0, z_1, z_2] = [z_0, \lambda^{m_1} z_1, \lambda^{m_2} z_2] \tag{4.6}$$

for $\lambda \in S^1$ and $m_i \in \mathbb{Z}$, which preserves the Fubini-Study metric.

Before considering the next example, recall that every finite group acting freely on S^3 is in fact a subgroup of $O(4)$, and hence its quotient 3-manifold admits a metric of constant positive curvature. This follows from the space form conjecture finally proven by G. Perelman. (See [24].)

In $S^1 \times (L_1 \# \cdots \# L_n)$, the action is defined as a rotation along the S^1-factor, which obviously preserves a product metric where $L_1 \# \cdots \# L_n$ is endowed with a metric of positive scalar curvature via the Gromov-Lawson surgery [18]. Finally this S^1 action on $S^1 \times L$ can be naturally extended to $\widehat{S^1 \times L}$, and moreover the Gromov-Lawson surgery [18] on $S^1 \times \{pt\}$ produces an S^1-invariant metric of positive scalar curvature.

Now $X \# knZ$ has an obvious $\mathbb{Z}_k$-action induced from that of X and a $\mathbb{Z}_k$-invariant metric which has positive scalar curvature again by the Gromov-Lawson surgery.

It remains to prove that the above $\mathbb{Z}_k$-action on $X \# knZ$ can be lifted to the Spin^c structure obtained by gluing the above $\mathfrak{s}_X$ and $\mathfrak{s}_Z$. For this, we will only prove that any such $\mathfrak{s}_X$ is $\mathbb{Z}_k$-equivariant. Then one can glue k copies of nZ in an obvious $\mathbb{Z}_k$-equivariant way. Recalling that the $\mathbb{Z}_k$ action on X actually comes from an S^1 action, we will actually show the S^1-equivariance of $\mathfrak{s}_X$ on X.

On S^4, the unique Spin^c structure is trivial. Thus any smooth S^1 action on S^4 which is obviously lifted to its oriented orthonormal frame bundle has a unique $\mathbb{Z}_2$-equivariant lifting to its spin bundle at least locally. To prove the global well-definedness of this lifting, it's enough to show that the monodromy is trivial around an orbit in S^4, because the orbit space is connected. Around any free orbit, one can trivialize the oriented orthonormal frame bundle so that the S^1 action on the bundle is trivial. This proves that the triviality of the monodromy of the induced local action on the Spin bundle around the orbit. Thus we have a global induced S^1 action on the spin bundle, and this action is trivially extended to (Spin bundle) $\otimes S^1$ and also to its Z_2-quotient, i.e. the trivial Spin^c structure by the $\mathbb{Z}_2$-equivariance of the action on the spin bundle.

Any smooth S^1 action on $\overline{\mathbb{C}P}_2$ is uniquely lifted to its orthonormal frame bundle F. Any Spin^c structure on $\overline{\mathbb{C}P}_2$ satisfying $c_1^2 = -1$ is the double cover of $F \oplus P$ or $F \oplus P^*$ where P is the principal S^1 bundle over $\overline{\mathbb{C}P}_2$ with $c_1(P) = [H]$ and P^* is its dual. Note that there is a base-preserving diffeomorphism between P and P^* whose total space is S^5. Obviously the action (4.6) is extended to $S^5 \subset \mathbb{C}^3$. Now as in the above S^4 case we trivialize $F \oplus P$ and $F \oplus P^*$ over a free orbit of $\overline{\mathbb{C}P}_2$ so that the S^1 actions on the bundles are trivial, and so these S^1-actions lift to the double covers of $F \oplus P$ and $F \oplus P^*$ respectively.

In case of $S^1 \times (L_1 \# \cdots \# L_n)$, any Spin^c structure is the pull-back from $L_1 \# \cdots \# L_n$, and satisfies $c_1^2 = 0 = -b_2$. Because the tangent bundle is trivial, a free S^1-action is obviously defined on its trivial spin bundle. Then the action can be obviously extended to any Spin^c structure, because it is pulled-back from $L_1 \# \cdots \# L_n$.

Lemma 4.11. *$\widehat{S^1 \times L}$ is a rational homology 4-sphere, and*

$$H^2(\widehat{S^1 \times L}; \mathbb{Z}) = H_1(L; \mathbb{Z}).$$

Its universal cover is $(|\pi_1(L)|-1)S^2\times S^2$ *where* $0(S^2\times S^2)$ *means* S^4.

Proof. Since the Euler characteristic is easily computed as 2 from the surgery description, and $b_1(\widehat{S^1\times L})=b_1(L)=0$, it follows that $\widehat{S^1\times L}$ is a rational homology 4-sphere.

By the universal coefficient theorem,

$$\begin{aligned} H^2(\widehat{S^1\times L};\mathbb{Z}) &= \mathrm{Hom}(H_2(\widehat{S^1\times L};\mathbb{Z}),\mathbb{Z})\oplus \mathrm{Ext}(H_1(\widehat{S^1\times L};\mathbb{Z}),\mathbb{Z})\\ &= H_1(L;\mathbb{Z}). \end{aligned}$$

The universal cover is equal to the manifold obtained from $S^1\times S^3$ by performing surgery along $S^1\times\{|\pi_1(L)|$ points in $S^3\}$, and hence it must be $(|\pi_1(L)|-1)S^2\times S^2$. □

By the above lemma, there are $|H_1(L;\mathbb{Z})|$ Spin^c structures on $\widehat{S^1\times L}$, all of which satisfy $c_1^2=0=-b_2(\widehat{S^1\times L})$. Let π denote the covering map from the universal cover. Since $H^2((|\pi_1(L)|-1)S^2\times S^2;\mathbb{Z})$ has no torsion, $c_1(\pi^*\mathfrak{s}_X)=\pi^*(c_1(\mathfrak{s}_X))$ which is torsion must be zero, and hence $\pi^*\mathfrak{s}_X$ is trivial.

Note that the S^1-action on $\widehat{S^1\times L}$ can be obviously lifted to its universal cover. Again by checking the triviality of the monodromy around a free orbit in $(|\pi_1(L)|-1)S^2\times S^2$, one can see that the S^1 action on its oriented orthonormal frame bundle lifts uniquely to its spin bundle and hence to the trivial Spin^c structure $\pi^*\mathfrak{s}_X$.

Finally note that this trivial Spin^c structure $\pi^*\mathfrak{s}_X$ modulo the deck transformation group $\pi_1(\widehat{S^1\times L})$ is $\mathfrak{s}_X$. Thus we need to show the liftings to $\pi^*\mathfrak{s}_X$ of the deck transformations commute with the above S^1-action on $\pi^*\mathfrak{s}_X$ so that this S^1 action projects down to $\mathfrak{s}_X$. All such possible liftings of deck transformations are

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Hom}(\pi_1(\widehat{S^1\times L}),S^1) &= \mathrm{Hom}(H_1(\widehat{S^1\times L};\mathbb{Z}),S^1)\\ &= H_1(\widehat{S^1\times L};\mathbb{Z}) \end{aligned}$$

up to homotopy, where the second equality is because $H_1(\widehat{S^1\times L};\mathbb{Z})$ is torsion. Thus they act as constants in S^1 on the trivial Spin^c structure $\pi^*\mathfrak{s}_X$. Then they must commute with the above S^1-action by the local uniqueness of the S^1-action on the spin bundle.

This completes the proof. □

Remark In case of $\widehat{S^1\times L}$, there may be other $\mathbb{Z}_k$-actions satisfying our condition. For instance, if L is a Lens space, one can easily see that there are $\mathbb{Z}_k$-actions coming from non-free S^1-actions of S^3 commuting with the action giving the quotient L. Moreover, one can also take a combination of this action and the above defined action so that $\widehat{S^1 \times L}/\mathbb{Z}_k$ is an orbifold. □

5. Connected sums and $\mathbb{Z}_k$-Bauer-Furuta invariant

Theorem 5.1. *If $BF_{M,\mathfrak{s}}$ is nontrivial, so is $BF^{\mathbb{Z}_k}_{\bar{M}_k,\bar{\mathfrak{s}}}$. If $b_1(N)^{\mathbb{Z}_k} = 0$, then*

$$BF^{\mathbb{Z}_k}_{\bar{M}_k,\bar{\mathfrak{s}}} = BF_{M,\mathfrak{s}}.$$

Proof. Let $\tilde{M}_k = N \cup \amalg_{i=1}^{k}(M \cup S^4)$ be the disjoint union of N and k-copies of $M \cup S^4$, and endow it with a Spin^c structure $\tilde{\mathfrak{s}}$ which is $\mathfrak{s}_N$ on N, $\mathfrak{s}$ on each M, and the trivial Spin^c structure $\mathfrak{s}_0$ on each S^4. Then $(\tilde{M}_k, \tilde{\mathfrak{s}})$ has an obvious $\mathbb{Z}_k$-action induced from the $\mathbb{Z}_k$-action on $\bar{\mathfrak{s}}$ in a unique way up to homotopy. (Here $\mathbb{Z}_k$ acts on $\amalg_{i=1}^{k} S^4$ by the obvious cyclic permutation, and on its Spin^c structure as constants coming from the action on $\bar{\mathfrak{s}}$ over the cylindrical gluing regions.)

Just as the ordinary monopole maps shown in [5], the stable cohomotopy class of the disjoint union of G-monopole maps is equal to the smash product $\wedge$ of those, and hence

$$\begin{aligned}
BF^{\mathbb{Z}_k}_{\tilde{M}_k,\tilde{\mathfrak{s}}} &= BF^{\mathbb{Z}_k}_{\amalg_{i=1}^{k}(M\cup S^4),\amalg_{i=1}^{k}(\mathfrak{s}\amalg\mathfrak{s}_0)} \wedge BF^{\mathbb{Z}_k}_{N,\mathfrak{s}_N}\\
&= BF_{M\cup S^4,\mathfrak{s}\amalg\mathfrak{s}_0} \wedge BF^{\mathbb{Z}_k}_{N,\mathfrak{s}_N}\\
&= BF_{M,\mathfrak{s}} \wedge BF_{S^4,\mathfrak{s}_0} \wedge BF^{\mathbb{Z}_k}_{N,\mathfrak{s}_N}\\
&= BF_{M,\mathfrak{s}} \wedge BF^{\mathbb{Z}_k}_{N,\mathfrak{s}_N},
\end{aligned}$$

where we used the fact that $BF_{S^4,\mathfrak{s}_0}$ is just $[id] \in \pi^0_{S^1}(*) \cong \mathbb{Z}$, which was shown in [5].

The surgery following S. Bauer in [5] [6] turns $\tilde{M}_k$ into the union of $\bar{M}_k$ and k-copies of $S^4 \amalg S^4$. We perform this surgery from $\tilde{M}_k$ to $\bar{M}_k \cup \amalg_{i=1}^{2k} S^4$ in a $\mathbb{Z}_k$-invariant way, and also "the gluing map V" from the Hilbert bundles $\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}$ on $Pic^{\mathbb{Z}_k}(\tilde{M}_k)$ to the Hilbert bundles on $Pic^{\mathbb{Z}_k}(\bar{M}_k \cup \amalg_{i=1}^{2k} S^4)$ in a $\mathbb{Z}_k$-invariant way. The homotopy of the ordinary monopole map of $\tilde{M}_k$ shown in [5] can also be done in a $\mathbb{Z}_k$-invariant way. Then those G-monopole maps of $\tilde{M}_k$ and $\bar{M}_k \cup \amalg_{i=1}^{2k} S^4$ are conjugate via "the gluing map V" up to $\mathbb{Z}_k$-invariant homotopy. Therefore their stable cohomotopy classes are equal so that

---

[6] This method needs k-copies of S^4 in $\tilde{M}_k$ for the interchange of parts to be an even permutation so that gluing of Hilbert bundles can be done continuously. For more details of gluing theory, the readers are referred to [5].

$$\begin{aligned} BF^{\mathbb{Z}_k}_{\tilde{M}_k,\tilde{\mathfrak{s}}} &= BF^{\mathbb{Z}_k}_{\bar{M}_k\cup\amalg_{i=1}^{2k}S^4,\bar{\mathfrak{s}}\amalg\mathfrak{s}_0} \\ &= BF^{\mathbb{Z}_k}_{\bar{M}_k,\bar{\mathfrak{s}}}\wedge BF^{\mathbb{Z}_k}_{\amalg_{i=1}^{2k}S^4,\mathfrak{s}_0} \\ &= BF^{\mathbb{Z}_k}_{\bar{M}_k,\bar{\mathfrak{s}}}\wedge BF_{S^4\amalg S^4,\mathfrak{s}_0} \\ &= BF^{\mathbb{Z}_k}_{\bar{M}_k,\bar{\mathfrak{s}}}\wedge BF_{S^4,\mathfrak{s}_0}\wedge BF_{S^4,\mathfrak{s}_0} \\ &= BF^{\mathbb{Z}_k}_{\bar{M}_k,\bar{\mathfrak{s}}}, \end{aligned}$$

where we again used that $BF_{S^4,\mathfrak{s}_0}=[id]$.

Therefore we obtained

$$BF^{\mathbb{Z}_k}_{\bar{M}_k,\bar{\mathfrak{s}}}=BF_{M,\mathfrak{s}}\wedge BF^{\mathbb{Z}_k}_{N,\mathfrak{s}_N},$$

and the case of $b_1(N)^{\mathbb{Z}_k}=0$ is derived from the following lemma :

Lemma 5.2. *If $b_1(N)^{\mathbb{Z}_k}=0$, then $BF^{\mathbb{Z}_k}_{N,\mathfrak{s}_N}$ is the class of the identity map*

$$[id]\in\pi^0_{S^1}(*)\cong\mathbb{Z}.$$

Proof. The method of proof is basically the same as the ordinary Bauer-Furuta invariant in [5].

First, we need to show that the $\mathbb{Z}_k$-index of the Spin^c Dirac operator is zero. Take a $\mathbb{Z}_k$-invariant metric of positive scalar curvature on N. Using the homotopy invariance of G-index, we compute the index at a $\mathbb{Z}_k$-invariant connection A_0 whose curvature 2-form is harmonic and hence anti-self-dual.

Applying the Weitzenböck formula with the fact that the scalar curvature of N is positive, and the curvature 2-form is anti-self-dual, we get zero kernel. Now then from the vanishing of the ordinary index given by $(c_1^2-\tau(N))/8$, the cokernel must be also zero. In particular, we have vanishing of $\mathbb{Z}_k$-invariant kernel and cokernel, implying that the $\mathbb{Z}_k$-index is zero.

Then along with $b_1(N)^{\mathbb{Z}_k}=b_2^+(N)^{\mathbb{Z}_k}=0$, we conclude that $BF^{\mathbb{Z}_k}_{N,\mathfrak{s}_N}$ belongs to $\pi^0_{S^1}(*)$ which is isomorphic to $\pi^0_{st}(*)=\mathbb{Z}$ by the isomorphism induced by restriction to the S^1-fixed point set on which the G-monopole map is just the linear isomorphism :

$$L^2_{m+1}(\Lambda^1N)^{\mathbb{Z}_k}\times H^0(N)^{\mathbb{Z}_k}\to L^2_m(\Lambda^2_+N)^{\mathbb{Z}_k}\times L^2_m(\Lambda^0N)^{\mathbb{Z}_k}\times H^1(N)^{\mathbb{Z}_k}$$

$$(a,c)\mapsto(d^+a,d^*a+c,a^{harm}),$$

because it has no kernel and cokernel. This completes the proof. □

Now let's consider the case of $b_1(N)^{\mathbb{Z}_k}\geq 1$. Again the $\mathbb{Z}_k$-index bundle of the Spin^c Dirac operator over $Pic^{\mathbb{Z}_k}(N)=T^{b_1(N)^{\mathbb{Z}_k}}$ is zero so that $BF^{\mathbb{Z}_k}_{N,\mathfrak{s}_N}$ belongs to $\pi^0_{S^1}(T^{b_1(N)^{\mathbb{Z}_k}})$.

Following [20], we consider the restriction map

$$\sigma : \pi^0_{S^1}(T^{b_1(N)^{\mathbb{Z}_k}}) \to \pi^0_{S^1}(pt)$$

to the fiber over a point in $Pic^{\mathbb{Z}_k}(N)$. By the same method as the above lemma, $\sigma(BF^{\mathbb{Z}_k}_{N,\mathfrak{s}_N})$ is just the identity map. Then the restriction of $BF^{\mathbb{Z}_k}_{\bar{M}_k,\tilde{\mathfrak{s}}} = BF^{\mathbb{Z}_k}_{\tilde{M}_k,\tilde{\mathfrak{s}}}$ to

$$Pic^{\mathbb{Z}_k}(\amalg_{i=1}^k (M \cup S^4)) \times \{pt\} \subset Pic^{\mathbb{Z}_k}(\tilde{M}_k) = Pic^{\mathbb{Z}_k}(\bar{M}_k)$$

is given by

$$BF_{M,\mathfrak{s}} \wedge \sigma(BF^{\mathbb{Z}_k}_{N,\mathfrak{s}_N}) = BF_{M,\mathfrak{s}},$$

completing the proof. □

6. Exotic group actions

Following [17], we say that a simply connected 4-manifold *dissolves* if it is diffeomorphic either to

$$n\mathbb{C}P_2\#m\overline{\mathbb{C}P}_2 \quad \text{or to} \quad \pm\,(n(S^2 \times S^2)\#mK3)$$

for some $n, m \geq 0$ according to its homeomorphism type. We also use the term *mod 2 basic class* to mean the first Chern class of a Spin^c structure with nonzero mod 2 Seiberg-Witten invariant.

Theorem 6.1. *Let M be a smooth closed 4-manifold and $\{M_i | i \in \mathfrak{I}\}$ be a family of smooth 4-manifolds such that every M_i is homeomorphic to M and the numbers of mod 2 basic classes of M_i's are all mutually different, but each $M_i\#l_i(S^2 \times S^2)$ is diffeomorphic to $M\#l_i(S^2 \times S^2)$ for an integer $l_i \geq 1$.*

If $l_{max} := \sup_{i\in\mathfrak{I}} l_i < \infty$, then for any integers $k \geq 2$ and $l \geq l_{max} + 1$,

$$klM\#(l-1)(S^2 \times S^2)$$

admits an $\mathfrak{I}$-family of topologically equivalent but smoothly distinct non-free actions of $\mathbb{Z}_k \oplus H$ where H is any group of order l acting freely on S^3.

Proof. Think of $klM\#(l-1)(S^2 \times S^2)$ as

$$klM_i\#(l-1)(S^2 \times S^2),$$

and our H action is defined as the deck transformation map of the l-fold covering map onto

$$\bar{M}_{i,k} := kM_i\#\widehat{S^1 \times L}$$

where $\widehat{S^1 \times L}$ for $L = S^3/H$ is defined as in theorem 4.10. To define a $\mathbb{Z}_k$-action, note that $\bar{M}_{i,k}$ has a $\mathbb{Z}_k$-action coming from the $\mathbb{Z}_k$-action of $\widehat{S^1 \times L}$ defined in theorem 4.10, which is basically a rotation along the S^1-direction.

This $\mathbb{Z}_k$ action is obviously lifted to the above l-fold cover, and moreover it commutes with the above defined H action. Thus we have an $\mathfrak{I}$-family of $\mathbb{Z}_k \oplus H$ actions on $klM\#(l-1)(S^2 \times S^2)$, which are all topologically equivalent by using the homeomorphism between each M_i and M.

Recall from theorem 4.10 that all the Spin^c structures on $\widehat{S^1 \times L}$ are $\mathbb{Z}_k$-equivariant and satisfy $c_1^2 = -b_2(\widehat{S^1 \times L})$. By theorem 4.2 and the fact that $b_1(\widehat{S^1 \times L}) = 0$, for any Spin^c structure $\mathfrak{s}$ on M_i,

$$SW^{\mathbb{Z}_k}_{\bar{M}_{i,k},\bar{\mathfrak{s}}} \equiv SW_{M_i,\mathfrak{s}} \mod 2,$$

and hence

$$SW^{\mathbb{Z}_k}_{\bar{M}_{i,k}} \equiv SW_{M_i} \sum_{[\alpha]\in H^2(\widehat{S^1\times L};\mathbb{Z})} [\alpha]$$

modulo 2. Therefore $SW^{\mathbb{Z}_k}_{\bar{M}_{i,k}}$ mod 2 for all i have mutually different numbers of monomials, and hence the $\mathfrak{I}$-family of $\mathbb{Z}_k \oplus H$ actions on $klM\#(l-1)(S^2 \times S^2)$ cannot be smoothly equivalent, completing the proof. □

Corollary 6.2. *Let H be a finite group of order $l \geq 2$ acting freely on S^3. For any $k \geq 2$, there exists an infinite family of topologically equivalent but smoothly distinct non-free actions of $\mathbb{Z}_k \oplus H$ on*

$$(klm + l - 1)(S^2 \times S^2),$$
$$(kl(n-1) + l - 1)(S^2 \times S^2)\# klnK3,$$
$$(kl(2n'-1) + l - 1)\mathbb{C}P_2 \# (kl(10n' + m' - 1) + l - 1)\overline{\mathbb{C}P}_2$$

for infinitely many m, and any $n \geq 1$, $n' \geq 2$, $m' \geq 1 - 2(\frac{n'}{2} - [\frac{n'}{2}])$.

Proof. By the result of B. Hanke, D. Kotschick, and J. Wehrheim [19], $m(S^2 \times S^2)$ for infinitely many m has the property of M in the above theorem with each $l_i = 1$. The different smooth structures of their examples are constructed by fiber-summing a logarithmic transform of $E(2n)$ and a certain symplectic 4-manifold along a symplectically embedded torus, and different numbers of mod 2 basic classes are due to those different logarithmic transformations. Indeed the Seiberg-Witten polynomial of the multiplicity r logarithmic transform of $E(2n)$ is given by

$$([T]^r - [T]^{-r})^{2n-2}([T]^{r-1} + [T]^{r-3} + \cdots + [T]^{1-r})$$

whose number of terms with coefficients mod 2 can be made arbitrarily large by taking r sufficiently large, and the fiber sum with the other symplectic 4-manifold is performed on a fiber in an $N(2)$ disjoint from the Gompf nucleus $N(2n)$ where the log transform is performed so that all these mod 2 basic classes survive the fiber-summing by the gluing formula of C. Taubes [36]. Therefore $(klm + l - 1)(S^2 \times S^2)$ has desired actions by the above theorem.

For the second example, we use a well-known fact that $E(n)$ also has the above properties of M in the above theorem with each $l_i = 1$, where its exotica M_i's are $E(n)_K$ for a knot $K \subset S^3$ by the Fintushel-Stern knot surgery. Recall the theorem by S. Akbulut [1] and D. Auckly [3] which says that for any smooth closed simply-connected X with an embedded torus T such that $T \cdot T = 0$ and $\pi_1(X - T) = 0$, a knot-surgered manifold X_K along T via a knot K satisfies

$$X_K\#(S^2 \times S^2) = X\#(S^2 \times S^2).$$

And from the formula

$$SW_{E(n)_K} \quad = \quad \Delta_K([T]^2)([T] - [T]^{-1})^{n-2}$$

where Δ_K is the symmetrized Alexander polynomial of K, one can easily see that the number of mod 2 basic classes of $E(n)_K$ can be made arbitrarily large by choosing K appropriately. (For example, take K with

$$\Delta_K(t) = 1 + \sum_{j=1}^{2d}(-1)^j(t^{jn} + t^{-jn})$$

for sufficiently large d.) Therefore

$$klE(2n)\#(l-1)(S^2 \times S^2) = klnK3\#(kl(n-1) + l - 1)S^2 \times S^2$$

has desired actions, where we used the fact that $S\#(S^2 \times S^2)$ dissolves for any smooth closed simply-connected elliptic surface S by the work of R. Mandelbaum ([22]) and R. Gompf ([16]).

For the third example, one can take M to be $E(n')\#m'\overline{\mathbb{C}P}_2$, where its exotica M_i's are $E(n')_K\#m'\overline{\mathbb{C}P}_2$ for a knot K, because

$$\begin{aligned} SW_{E(n')_K\#m'\overline{\mathbb{C}P}_2} &= SW_{(E(n')\#m'\overline{\mathbb{C}P}_2)_K} \\ &= \Delta_K([T]^2)([T] - [T]^{-1})^{n'-2}\prod_{i=1}^{m'}([E_i] + [E_i]^{-1}), \end{aligned}$$

where E_i's denote the exceptional divisors, and we used the fact that $E(n')$ is of simple type. Since $E(n')$ for odd n' and $E(n')\#\overline{\mathbb{C}P}_2$ for any n' are non-spin,

$$kl(E(n')\#m'\overline{\mathbb{C}P}_2)\#(l-1)(S^2\times S^2) = kl(E(n')\#m'\overline{\mathbb{C}P}_2)\#(l-1)(\mathbb{C}P_2\#\overline{\mathbb{C}P}_2),$$

and it dissolves into the connected sum of $\mathbb{C}P_2$'s and $\overline{\mathbb{C}P}_2$'s, using the dissolution ([22, 16]) of $E(n')\#\mathbb{C}P_2$ into $2n'\mathbb{C}P_2\#(10n'-1)\overline{\mathbb{C}P}_2$. $\square$

Remark When L is a Lens space, one can take other $\mathbb{Z}_k$-actions on $\widehat{S^1 \times L}$

mentioned in the remark of section 4 such that its $\mathbb{Z}_k$-quotient is an orbifold, it follows that

$$\bar{M}_{i,k}/\mathbb{Z}_k = M_i\#(\widehat{S^1 \times L}/\mathbb{Z}_k),$$

and one can use the orbifold Seiberg-Witten invariant introduced by W. Chen [7, 8] to show that Seiberg-Witten polynomials $SW_{\bar{M}_{i,k}/\mathbb{Z}_k}$ are all distinct and hence $\bar{M}_{i,k}/\mathbb{Z}_k$ are mutually non-diffeomorphic as orbifolds. This is another way of proving the smooth inequivalence of such $\mathbb{Z}_k \oplus H$ actions on $klM\#(l-1)(S^2\times S^2)$.

For other combinations of $K3$ surfaces and $S^2\times S^2$'s in the above corollary, one can use B. Hanke, D. Kotschick, and J. Wehrheim's other examples in [19]. One can also construct many other such examples of M with infinitely many exotica which become diffeomorphic after one stabilization by using the knot surgery. $\square$

Acknowledgement. The author would like to express sincere thanks to Prof. Ki-Heon Yun for helpful discussions and supports.

REFERENCES

[1] S. Akbulut, *Variations on Fintushel-Stern knot surgery on 4-manifolds*, Turkish J. of Math. **26** (2002), 81–92.

[2] S. Akbulut, *Cappell-Shaneson homotopy spheres are standard*, Ann. of Math. **171** (2010), 2171–2175.

[3] D. Auckly, *Families of four-dimensional manifolds that become mutually diffeomorphic after one stablization*, Proceedings of the Pacific Institute for the Mathematical Sciences Workshop "Invariants of Three-Manifolds"(Calgary, AB, 1999) **127** (2003), 277–298.

[4] S. Bauer and M. Furuta, *A stable cohomotopy refinement of Seiberg-Witten invariants: I*, Invent. Math. **155** (2004), 1–19.

[5] S. Bauer, *A stable cohomotopy refinement of Seiberg-Witten invariants: II*, Invent. Math. **155** (2004), 21–40.

[6] S. Capell and J. Shaneson, *Some new four-manifolds*, Ann. of Math. **104** (1976), 61–72.

[7] W. Chen, *Pseudoholomorphic curves in four-orbifolds and some applications*, in 'Geomtery and Topology of Manifolds', Fields Institute Communications **47** (2005), 11–37.

[8] W. Chen, *Smooth s-cobordisms of elliptic 3-manifolds*, J. Diff. Geom. **73** (2006), 413–490.

[9] Y. S. Cho, *Finite group action on Spin^c bundles*, Acta Math. Hungar. **84 (1-2)** (1999), 97–114.

[10] S. K. Donaldson, *An application of gauge theory to four dimensional topology*, J. Diff. Geom. **18** (1983), 279–315.

[11] S. K. Donaldson, *The orientation of Yang-Mills moduli spaces and 4-manifold topology*, J. Diff. Geom. **26** (1987), 397–428.

[12] R. Fintushel and R. Stern, *An exotic free involution on S^4*, Ann. of Math. **113** (1981), 357–365.

[13] R. Fintushel and R. Stern, *Exotic group action on simply connected smooth 4-manifolds*, J. of Topology **2** (2009), 769–778.

[14] R. Gompf, *Killing the Akbulut-Kirby 4-sphere, with relevance to the Andrews-Curtis and Schoenflies problems*, Topology **30** (1991), 97–115.

[15] R. Gompf, *More Capell-Shaneson spheres are standard*, arXiv:0908.1914.

[16] R. Gompf, *Sums of elliptic surfaces*, J. Diff. Geom. **34** (1991), 93–114.

[17] R. Gompf and A. Stipsicz, *4-Manifolds and Kirby Calculus*, American Mathematical Society, 1999.

[18] M. Gromov and H. B. Lawson, *The classification of simply connected manifolds of positive scalar curvature*, Ann. of Math. **111** (1980) 423–434.

[19] B. Hanke, D. Kotschick, and J. Wehrheim, *Dissolving four-manifolds and positive scalar curvature*, Math. Zeitschrift **245** (2003), 545–555

[20] M. Ishida and C. LeBrun, *Curvature, connected Sums, and Seiberg-Witten Theory*, Comm. Anal. Geom. **11** (2003), 809–836.

[21] P. Kronheimer and T. Mrowka, *Monopoles and three-manifolds*, Cambridge University Press, 2008.

[22] R. Mandelbaum, *Decomposing analytic surfaces*, in “Geomtric Topology”, Proc. 1977 Georgia Topology Conference, Academic Press, 1979, 147–217.

[23] J. Morgan, *The Seiberg-Witten equations and applications to the topology of smooth four-manifold*, Princeton University Press, 1996.

[24] J. Morgan and G. Tian, *Ricci flow and the Poincaré Conjecture*, American Mathematical Society, 2007.

[25] N. Nakamura, *A free $\mathbb{Z}_p$-action and the Seiberg-Witten invariants*, J. Korean Math. Soc. **39** (2002), No. 1, 103–117.

[26] N. Nakamura, *Bauer-Furuta invariants under $\mathbb{Z}_2$-actions*, Math. Z. **262** (2009), 219-233.

[27] N. Nakamura, *Mod p equality theorem for Seiberg-Witten invariants under $\mathbb{Z}_p$-action*, arXiv:0905.3022.

[28] L. I. Nicolaescu, *Notes on Seiberg-Witten Theory*, American Mathematical Society, 2000.

[29] Y. Ruan, *Virtual neighborhoods and the monopole equations*, Topics in symplectic 4-manifolds, 101–116, First Int. Press Lect. Ser. I, Int. Press, Cambridge, MA, 1998.

[30] Y. Ruan and S. Wang, *Seiberg-Witten invariants and double covers of 4-manifolds*, Comm. Anal. Geom. **8** (2000), No.3, 477–515.

[31] P. Safari, *Gluing Seiberg-Witten Monopoles*, Comm. Anal. Geom. **13** (2005), No. 4, 697–725.

[32] C. Sung, *Surgery, curvature, and minimal volume*, Ann. Global Anal. Geom. **26** (2004), 209–229.

[33] C. Sung, *Surgery, Yamabe invariant, and Seiberg-Witten theory*, J. Geom. Phys. **59** (2009), 246–255.

[34] C. Sung, *G-monopole classes, Einstein metrics, and Yamabe invariants of 4-manifolds*, preprint.

[35] M. Szymik, *Bauer-Furuta invariants and Galois symmetries*, preprint.

[36] C. H. Taubes, *The Seiberg-Witten invariants and 4-manifolds with essential tori*, Geom. Topol. **5** (2001), 441–519.

[37] S. Vidussi, *Seiberg-Witten theory for* 4*-manifolds decomposed along* 3*-manifolds of positive scalar curvature*, Prépublication École Polytechnique **99-5** (1999).

[38] M. Ue, *Exotic group actions in dimension four and Seiberg-Witten theory*, Proc. Japan Acad. Ser. A Math. Sci. **74** (1998), 68–70.

Dept. of Mathematics and Institute for Mathematical Sciences, Konkuk University, 1 Hwayang-dong, Gwangjin-gu, Seoul, KOREA
E-mail address: `cysung@kias.re.kr`